

A PROBLEM ON SPREADING MODELS

E. ODELL AND TH. SCHLUMPRECHT

ABSTRACT. It is proved that if a Banach space X has a basis (e_n) satisfying every spreading model of a normalized block basis of (e_n) is 1-equivalent to the unit vector basis of ℓ_1 (respectively, c_0) then X contains ℓ_1 (respectively, c_0). Furthermore Tsirelson's space T is shown to have the property that every infinite dimensional subspace contains a sequence having spreading model 1-equivalent to the unit vector basis of ℓ_1 . An equivalent norm is constructed on T so that $\|s_1 + s_2\| < 2$ whenever (s_n) is a spreading model of a normalized basic sequence in T .

§0. Introduction.

From the fact that ℓ_1 (and c_0) are not distortable [J] it follows that if a Banach space X contains ℓ_1 (or c_0) then some basic sequence (e_i) in X has the property that every spreading model of a normalized block basis is 1-equivalent to the unit vector basis of ℓ_1 (or c_0). In this paper we prove the converse statements. More generally we show

Theorem A. *Let (e_i) be a basis for X*

- a) *If $\|s_1 + s_2\| = 2$ whenever (s_n) is any spreading model of a normalized block basis of (e_i) , then X contains a subspace isomorphic to ℓ_1 .*
- b) *If $\|s_1 + s_2\| = 1$ whenever (s_n) is any spreading model of a normalized block basis of (e_i) , then X contains a subspace isomorphic to c_0 .*

The proof of a) will be achieved by showing that such an (e_i) cannot be weakly null, if normalized. The proof will depend heavily on the theory of the generalized

Research supported by NSF and TARP.

Schreier classes of subsets of $\mathbb{N}$ as introduced in [AA]. We make strong use of recent results in [AMT] as well as a result from [AO].

From Theorem A we obtain the

Corollary. *Let (e_i) be a basis for X . If X contains no subspace isomorphic to ℓ_1 or c_0 then there exists a normalized block basis of (e_i) having spreading model (s_i) satisfying*

$$1 < \|s_1 + s_2\| < 2 .$$

Theorem A a) is proved in §2 while part b) and the (easy) Corollary are proved in §3.

In conjunction with Theorem A it is worth considering Tsirelson's space T . T is reflexive with an unconditional basis (t_i) and yet all spreading models of normalized block bases of (t_i) are 2-equivalent to the unit vector basis of ℓ_1 . Furthermore we have

Theorem B. *Let X be an infinite dimensional subspace of T . Then there exists $(x_i) \subseteq X$ with spreading model 1-equivalent to the unit vector basis of ℓ_1 .*

We prove this theorem in §4. Furthermore we show that T can be renormed to fail the conclusion of Theorem B.

We do not know if Theorem A can be extended to ℓ_p ($1 < p < \infty$).

Problem. Let (e_i) be a basis for X and $1 < p < \infty$. Suppose that every spreading model of any normalized block basis of (e_i) is 1-equivalent to the unit vector basis of ℓ_p . Does X contain ℓ_p , either isomorphically or almost isometrically?

§1 Preliminaries.

Definition 1.1. Let (e_i) be a normalized basic sequence. A basic sequence (s_i) is a *spreading model* of (e_i) if for some sequence $\varepsilon_n \downarrow 0$ and all $(a_i)_1^n \subseteq [-1, 1]^n$ we have

$$\left| \left\| \sum_1^n a_i e_{k_i} \right\| - \left\| \sum_1^n a_i s_i \right\| \right| < \varepsilon_n \text{ whenever } n \leq k_1 < \cdots < k_n .$$

It is well known that every normalized basic sequence has a subsequence with a spreading model. Also (s_i) is necessarily *spreading* ($\|\sum_1^n a_i s_i\| = \|\sum_1^n a_i s_{k_i}\|$ if $k_1 < k_2 < \dots < k_n$). If (e_i) is weakly null then (s_i) is suppression-1-unconditional ($\|\sum_F a_i s_i\| \leq \|\sum_1^n a_i s_i\|$ if $F \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$). These and other results on spreading models can be found in [BL].

$[\mathbb{N}]$ denotes the set of all subsequences of $\mathbb{N}$. If $M \in [\mathbb{N}]$, $[M]$ is the set of all subsequences of M . $[M]^{<\omega}$ is the class of all finite subsets of M . If $E, F \in [\mathbb{N}]^{<\omega}$, “ $E < F$ ” means that $\max E < \min F$, “ $k < E$ ” means $\{k\} < E$.

Definition 1.2. [AA] **Generalized Schreier classes.** The classes $(S_\alpha)_{\alpha < \omega_1}$ of collections of finite subsets of $\mathbb{N}$ are inductively defined as follows

$$\begin{aligned} S_0 &= \{\{n\} : n \in \mathbb{N}\} \\ S_{\alpha+1} &= \left\{ E : E = \bigcup_1^k E_i \text{ for some } k \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and} \right. \\ &\quad \left. k \leq E_1 < \dots < E_k \text{ where } E_i \in S_\alpha \text{ for } i \leq k \right\} \end{aligned}$$

If α is a limit ordinal, choose $\alpha_n \uparrow \alpha$ and set $S_\alpha = \{E : k \leq E \in S_{\alpha_k} \text{ for some } k \in \mathbb{N}\}$. We also consider the empty set $\emptyset \in S_\alpha$ for all α . The definition of S_α depends upon this particular choice of (α_n) but the results we use concerning the S_α ’s are independent of that choice.

The Schreier classes have played a prominent role in a number of recent papers (e.g., [AA], [AD], [AMT], [OTW], [AO]).

If $M = (m_i) \in [\mathbb{N}]$ and $\alpha < \omega_1$, $S_\alpha(M) = \{(m_i)_{i \in F} : F \in S_\alpha\}$. It is easy to see that $S_\alpha(M) \subseteq S_\alpha$. We also recall that the classes S_α (or $S_\alpha(M)$) are all *regular*. By this we mean they are pointwise closed, *hereditary* ($E \subseteq F \in S_\alpha \Rightarrow E \in S_\alpha$) and *spreading* ($((n_i)_1^k \in S_\alpha$ and $m_1 < \dots < m_k$ with $m_i \geq n_i$ for $i \leq k$ implies that $(m_i)_1^k \in S_\alpha$).

Proposition 1.3 [AO]. *Let $N \in [\mathbb{N}]$. There exists $M \in [N]$ such that for all $\alpha < \omega_1$ if $F \in S_\alpha$ and $F \subseteq M$ then $F \setminus \min(F) \in S_\alpha(N)$.*

We also need some definitions and a result from [AMT]. Let

Definition 1.4 [AMT]. If $M = (m_i) \in [\mathbb{N}]$ and (e_i) is a normalized basic sequence we inductively define $\alpha_n^M = \alpha_n^M(e_i)$ for $\alpha < \omega_1$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ as follows

$$\begin{aligned} 0_n^M &= e_{m_n} \\ (\alpha + 1)_1^M &= \frac{1}{m_1} \sum_{i=1}^{m_1} \alpha_i^M \\ (\alpha + 1)_{n+1}^M &= \frac{1}{m_{k_n}} \sum_{i=1}^{m_{k_n}} \alpha_i^{M'} \end{aligned}$$

where $M' = \{m \in M : m > \text{supp}(\alpha + 1)_n^M\}$ and $m_{k_n} = \min M'$. If $\alpha = \lim \alpha_n$ is a limit ordinal we set

$$\alpha_1^M = (\alpha_{m_1})_1^M \quad \text{and for } k > 1, \quad \alpha_k^M = (\alpha_{n_k})_1^{M_k}$$

where $M_k = \{m \in M : m > \text{supp} \alpha_{k-1}^M\}$ and $n_k = \min M_k$.

Proposition 1.5 [AMT].

- 1) For $\alpha < \omega_1$, $(\alpha_n^M)_{n=1}^\infty = (\alpha_n^M(e_i))_{n=1}^\infty$ is a convex block basis of (e_i) with $M = \bigcup_n \text{supp}(\alpha_n^M)$. Moreover $\text{supp} \alpha_n^M \in S_\alpha$ for all n .
- 2) If $M \in [\mathbb{N}]$, $\alpha < \omega_1$ and $(n_k) \in [\mathbb{N}]$ then $\alpha_{n_k}^M = \alpha_k^{M'}$ where $M' = \bigcup_k \text{supp}(\alpha_{n_k}^M)$.

If $x = \sum a_i e_i \in \langle e_i \rangle$ and $F \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ we define $\langle x, F \rangle = \sum_{i \in F} a_i$.

Definition 1.6 [AMT]. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be an hereditary collection of subsets of $\mathbb{N}$. Let $M \in [\mathbb{N}]$, $\varepsilon > 0$, $\alpha < \omega_1$ and let (e_i) be a normalized basic sequence. $\mathcal{F}$ is (M, α, ε) large if for all $N \in [M]$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ for $\alpha_n^N = \alpha_n^N(e_i)$,

$$\sup_{F \in \mathcal{F}} \langle \alpha_n^N, F \rangle > \varepsilon.$$

Theorem 1.7 [AMT, Proposition 2.3.2 and Theorem 2.2.6]. If $\mathcal{F}$ is (M, α, ε) large then there exists $N \in [M]$ with

$$\mathcal{F} \supseteq S_\alpha(N).$$

§2. ℓ_1 spreading models.

In this section we prove

Theorem 2.1. *Let (e_i) be a normalized basis for X having the property that $\|s_1 + s_2\| = 2$ whenever (s_n) is a spreading model of (x_i) where $x_i = y_i/\|y_i\|$ and (y_i) is any convex block subsequence of (e_i) satisfying $\lim_i \|y_i\| > 0$. Then (e_i) is not weakly null. Moreover for all $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $M = (m_i) \in [\mathbb{N}]$ and $x^* \in S(X^*)$ with $x^*(e_{m_i}) > 1 - \varepsilon$ for all i .*

From Theorem 2.1 it follows that in a space X whose block bases have only ℓ_1 as spreading model no block basis is weakly null. Thus in light of Rosenthal's theorem [R], Theorem A a) is a quick consequence of Theorem 2.1.

The hypothesis yields that for all n , $\|\sum_1^{2^n} s_i\| = 2^n$ from which it follows that $\|\sum_1^k s_i\| = k$ for all k . We shall use this below in the following way. Given $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a subsequence (x_{n_k}) of (x_i) so that for all k , $\frac{1}{r_k}\|x_{n_k} + x_{n_{k+1}} + \cdots + x_{n_{k+r_k-1}}\| > 1 - \varepsilon$ where $r_k = \min(\text{supp}(x_{n_k}))$, w.r.t. (e_i) .

Proof. Given $\varepsilon > 0$ set

$$\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon = \{F \subseteq \mathbb{N} : \text{there exists } x^* \in S(X^*) \text{ with } x^*(e_i) > 1 - \varepsilon \text{ for } i \in F\}.$$

We shall prove by induction on α that (P_α) holds for all $\alpha < \omega_1$ where

$$(P_\alpha) \quad \begin{cases} \text{For all } M \in [\mathbb{N}] \text{ and } \varepsilon > 0 \text{ there exists} \\ N \in [M] \text{ with } \mathcal{F}_\varepsilon \supseteq S_\alpha(N). \end{cases}$$

(P_0) is clear. If α is a limit ordinal and S_α is defined via the sequence $\alpha_n \uparrow \alpha$ we proceed as follows. Given M and $\varepsilon > 0$ we can choose, by the inductive hypothesis, $M \supseteq N_1 \supseteq N_2 \supseteq \cdots$ so that $\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon \supseteq S_{\alpha_n}(N_n)$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $N_n = (k_i^n)_{i=1}^\infty$ and set $N = (k_i^n)_{n=1}^\infty$. Then $\mathcal{F}_\varepsilon \supseteq S_\alpha(N)$.

Finally assume that (P_β) holds and let $M \in [\mathbb{N}]$ and $\alpha = \beta + 1$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and choose $\varepsilon' > 0$ so that $\varepsilon' < \varepsilon/2$. We may assume that $\mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon'} \supseteq S_\beta(M)$.

Claim. There exists $N \in [M]$ so that $\mathcal{F}_{3\varepsilon}$ is (N, α, ε) large.

Indeed for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ define

$$\mathcal{A}_n = \left\{ L \in [M] : \sup_{F \in \mathcal{F}_{3\varepsilon}} \langle \alpha_n^L, F \rangle > \varepsilon \right\}.$$

Then $\mathcal{A}_n$ is a pointwise closed subset of $[\mathbb{N}]$ and so $\mathcal{A} = \bigcap_n \mathcal{A}_n$ is Ramsey (see [E], also [O]). Thus there exists $N \in [M]$ with either $[N] \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ or $[N] \subseteq [\mathbb{N}] \setminus \mathcal{A}$. By passing to a subsequence of N we may assume by Proposition 1.3, that for $\gamma < \omega_1$ if $F \in S_\gamma$, $F \subseteq N$ then $F \setminus \{\min(F) \in S_\gamma(M)\}$. Furthermore we may assume that for all n , $\|\beta_n^L\|_\infty < \varepsilon'$ for all $L \in [N]$. (Indeed this holds if $n_1 = \min N$ satisfies $n_1^{-1} < \varepsilon'$.) It follows that for all n , since $\text{supp } \beta_n^N \setminus \min(\text{supp } \beta_n^N) \in S_\beta(M) \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon'}$, that $\|\beta_n^N\| > 1 - 2\varepsilon'$. From the hypothesis of our theorem applied to $x_n = \beta_n^N / \|\beta_n^N\|$ we obtain a subsequence $(\beta_{n_k}^N)_{k=1}^\infty$ satisfying for all k :

$$(*) \quad \frac{1}{r_k} \|\beta_{n_k}^N + \beta_{n_{k+1}}^N + \cdots + \beta_{n_{k+r_k-1}}^N\| > 1 - 3\varepsilon'$$

where $r_k = \min(\text{supp } \beta_{n_k}^N)$.

Let $L = \bigcup_k \text{supp } \beta_{n_k}^N$. Then by Proposition 1.5, $\beta_k^L = \beta_{n_k}^N$. Hence from $(*)$ and the definition of α_n^L we have $\|\alpha_n^L\| > 1 - 3\varepsilon'$ for all n .

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x^* \in S(X^*)$ with $x^*(\alpha_n^L) > 1 - 3\varepsilon'$. Write $\alpha_n^L = \sum_1^p a_i e_i$ and set $F = \{i : x^*(e_i) > 1 - 3\varepsilon\}$. Then $\sum_{i \in F} a_i > \varepsilon$ (otherwise $x^*(\alpha_n^L) \leq \sum_{i \in F} a_i + 1 - 3\varepsilon \leq 1 - 2\varepsilon < 1 - 3\varepsilon'$). Thus $L \in \mathcal{A}$ and hence $[N] \subseteq \mathcal{A}$, whence the claim follows. Thus by Theorem 1.7, (P_α) holds (we actually proved (P_α) for 3ε replacing ε).

Since (P_α) holds for all $\alpha < \omega_1$ we obtain the “moreover” statement of the theorem. Indeed this follows easily from an argument of Bourgain [B]. Let T be the tree $T = \{(n_i)_1^k : n_1 < \cdots < n_k \text{ and there exists } x^* \in S(X^*) \text{ with } x^*(e_{n_i}) > 1 - \varepsilon \text{ for } i \leq k\}$. T is a closed tree and thus if T were well founded (no infinite branches) then the order of T is $< \omega_1$. But since (P_α) holds, the order of $T \geq \omega^\alpha$ for all α . The latter holds since the order of $S_\alpha(N)$ is ω^α , as is well known (see e.g., [AA] or [OTW]). $\square$

§3. c_0 spreading models.

In this section we prove Theorem A b) and the corollary. Note that the hypothesis yields that $\|\sum_1^n s_i\| = 1$ for all n . Also the hypothesis is satisfied if all spreading models of normalized block bases of (e_i) are 1-equivalent to the unit vector basis of c_0 but this is a stronger condition than the hypothesis as the following example indicates.

Example 3.1. Let $\|\sum_1^n a_i e_i\| = \max_{i < j} |a_i - a_j|$. Then if X is the completion of $(\langle e_i \rangle, \|\cdot\|)$, X satisfies the hypothesis of the theorem yet (e_i) , which is its own spreading model, is not 1-equivalent to the unit vector basis of c_0 .

Assume that X has a basis (e_i) satisfying the hypothesis of b). We break the proof into several steps. For $a, b \in \langle e_i \rangle$ we write “ $a < b$ ” if $\text{supp}(a) < \text{supp}(b)$.

Step 1. For all $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $m \in \mathbb{N}$ so that for all $a > e_m$ with $\|a\| = 1$ there exists $b_1 < \dots < b_\ell \leq e_m$, $\|b_i\| = 1$ for $i \leq \ell$, such that for all $1 \leq q \leq p \leq \ell$ and $\delta = 0$ or 1 ,

$$\left| \left\| \sum_q^p b_i + \delta a \right\| - 1 \right| < \varepsilon .$$

Proof. If not then there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $a_m > e_m$, $\|a_m\| = 1$ so that for all $b_1 < \dots < b_\ell \leq e_m$, $\|b_i\| = 1$ there exists $1 \leq q_m \leq p_m \leq \ell$ with for some $\delta_m = 0$ or 1 ,

$$\left| \left\| \sum_{q_m}^{p_m} b_i + \delta_m a_m \right\| - 1 \right| > \varepsilon .$$

Choose a subsequence (a_{m_i}) of (a_m) having a spreading model (s_i) . Since $\|\sum_1^{\ell+1} s_i\| = 1 = \|\sum_1^\ell s_i\|$, we may assume that $\left| \left\| \sum_q^p a_{m_i} + \delta a_{m_{\ell+1}} \right\| - 1 \right| < \varepsilon$ for all $q \leq p \leq \ell$ and $\delta = 0$ or 1 and that $a_{m_\ell} < e_{m_{\ell+1}}$. This contradicts our choice of $a_{m_{\ell+1}}$.

Let $\varepsilon_i \downarrow 0$ with $\sum_1^\infty \varepsilon_i < 1$. Applying Step 1 to $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_1$ and $\ell = 2$ we obtain m_1 so that for all $a > e_{m_1}$, $\|a\| = 1$ there exist $x_1 < y_1 \leq e_{m_1}$, $\|x_1\| = \|y_1\| = 1$ and

$$\left| \|x_1 + y_1 + a\| - 1 \right| < \varepsilon_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \left| \|y_1 + a\| - 1 \right| < \varepsilon_1 .$$

Step 2. There exist $1 = m_0 < m_1 < m_2 < \dots$ such that for all k and $a > e_{m_k}$, $\|a\| = 1$, there exists $x_1 < y_1 \leq e_{m_1} < x_2 < y_2 \leq e_{m_2} < \dots < x_k < y_k \leq e_{m_k}$ satisfying $|\|x_i\| - 1| < \varepsilon_i$, $|\|y_i\| - 1| < \varepsilon_i$ for $i \leq k$ and for all $F \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$

$$\left\| \sum_F x_i + \sum_1^k y_i + a \right\| \leq 1 + \sum_1^k \varepsilon_i .$$

Proof. We proceed by induction on k . The case $k = 1$ was presented above. Assume $m_1 < \dots < m_{k-1}$ have been chosen. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ satisfy $\frac{\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon} + (2k-2)\varepsilon < \varepsilon_k$. We can, by a compactness argument, find ℓ so that if the induction hypothesis for $k-1$ is applied to each of ℓ different a 's $> e_{m_{k-1}}$, say $(a_n)_1^\ell$, then if $(x_i^n)_1^{k-1}, (y_i^n)_1^{k-1}$ satisfy Step 2 for a_n , for some $n \neq m \leq \ell$ we have $\|x_i^n - x_i^m\|, \|y_i^n - y_i^m\| < \varepsilon$ for $i \leq k-1$. Choose m_k by Step 1 applied for this ℓ and ε to $(e_i)_{i=m_{k-1}+1}^\infty$. Let $a > e_{m_k}$ with $\|a\| = 1$. Choose $e_{m_{k-1}} < b_1 < \dots < b_\ell \leq e_{m_k} \leq a$ to satisfy

$$\left| \left\| \sum_q^p b_i + \delta a \right\| - 1 \right| < \varepsilon \text{ for } 1 \leq q \leq p \leq \ell, \quad \delta = 0, 1 .$$

By Step 2 (for $k-1$) there exists for $1 \leq q \leq \ell$, $x_1^q < y_1^q \leq e_{m_1} < \dots < x_{k-1}^q < y_{k-1}^q \leq e_{m_{k-1}}$ so that $|\|x_i^q\| - 1|, |\|y_i^q\| - 1| < \varepsilon_i$ for $i \leq k-1$ and so that for $F \subseteq \{1, \dots, k-1\}$,

$$\left\| \sum_F x_i^q + \sum_1^{k-1} y_i^q + \left\| \sum_q^\ell b_i + a \right\|^{-1} \left(\sum_q^\ell b_i + a \right) \right\| \leq 1 + \sum_1^{k-1} \varepsilon_i .$$

Thus

$$\left\| \sum_F x_i^q + \sum_1^{k-1} y_i^q + \sum_q^\ell b_i + a \right\| < 1 + \sum_1^{k-1} \varepsilon_i + \frac{\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon} .$$

Choose $q' < q$ so that $\|x_i^q - x_i^{q'}\|, \|y_i^q - y_i^{q'}\| < \varepsilon$ for $i \leq k-1$. Let $x_k = \sum_{q'}^{q-1} b_i$ and $y_k = \sum_q^\ell b_i$. We have $|\|x_k\| - 1|, |\|y_k\| - 1| < \varepsilon$ and for $F \subseteq \{1, \dots, k-1\}$

$$\begin{aligned} 1) \quad & \left\| \sum_F x_i^q + \sum_1^{k-1} y_i^q + y_k + a \right\| < 1 + \sum_1^{k-1} \varepsilon_i + \frac{\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon} , \\ 2) \quad & \left\| \sum_F x_i^{q'} + \sum_1^{k-1} y_i^{q'} + x_k + y_k + a \right\| < 1 + \sum_1^{k-1} \varepsilon_i + \frac{\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon} . \end{aligned}$$

It follows that if we set $x_i = x_i^q$, $y_i = y_i^q$ for $i \leq k-1$ then for $F \subseteq \{1, \dots, k\}$

$$3) \quad \left\| \sum_F x_i + \sum_1^k y_i + a \right\| \leq 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \varepsilon_i + \frac{\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon} + (2k-2)\varepsilon .$$

Thus Step 2 follows by our choice of ε .

Applying Step 2 to an arbitrary $a_k > e_{m_k}$, $\|a_k\| = 1$ we obtain that for all k there exists $x_i^k < y_i^k \in \langle e_j \rangle_{m_{k-1}+1}^{m_k}$ with $|\|x_i^k\| - 1|, |\|y_i^k\| - 1| < \varepsilon_i$ for $i \leq k$ and also for $F \subseteq \{1, \dots, k\}$,

$$\left\| \sum_F x_i^k + \sum_1^k y_i^k + a_k \right\| < 2 .$$

It follows that $\|\sum_F x_i^k\| < 4$.

Choose $(k_j) \in [\mathbb{N}]$ so that for all i , $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} x_i^{k_j} \equiv x_i$ exists. We have for all $F \in [\mathbb{N}]^{<\omega}$,

$$\left\| \sum_F x_i \right\| \leq 4 \quad \text{and} \quad |\|x_i\| - 1| < 1 + \varepsilon_i .$$

Thus (x_i) is equivalent to the unit vector basis of c_0 . $\square$

We end this section by presenting the

Proof of corollary to Theorem A.

If the corollary is false then all such s_i 's satisfy $\|s_1 + s_2\| = 1$ or 2 and by Theorem A both occur. Choose (y_n) and (z_n) , normalized block bases of (e_i) with spreading models (s_i) and (t_i) , respectively, satisfying $\|s_1 + s_2\| = 1$ and $\|t_1 + t_2\| = 2$. We may assume that $(y_1, z_1, y_2, z_2, \dots)$ is a block basis of (e_i) . Furthermore, by a diagonal argument, we may assume that $(\alpha y_n + \beta z_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ has a spreading model $(s_n^{\alpha, \beta})_{n=1}^\infty$ for all $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$ (not both 0). Now $s_n^{1,0} = s_n$ and $s_n^{0,1} = t_n$. There exists a continuous curve $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$, $\gamma(t) = (\alpha(t), \beta(t))$ so that $\|s^{\alpha(t), \beta(t)}\| = 1$ for all $t \in [0, 1]$ and $\gamma(0) = (1, 0)$, $\gamma(1) = (0, 1)$. We thus obtain by continuity that for all $r \in (1, 2)$ there exists t with

$$\|s_1^{\alpha(t), \beta(t)} + s_2^{\alpha(t), \beta(t)}\| = r .$$

$\square$

Remark 3.2. Let (e_i) be a basis for X and let $I(X) = \{r : \text{there exists a normalized block basis of } (e_i) \text{ having spreading model } (s_i) \text{ with } \|s_1 + s_2\| = r\}$. The proof shows that $I(X)$ is a subinterval of $[1, 2]$.

In the next section, Proposition 4.4, we shall see that $I(X)$ need not be closed.

§4. Theorem B and spreading models of T .

If (e_i) is a basic sequence and $x, y \in \langle e_i \rangle$ we say that x equals y in distribution ($x \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} y$) if there exist $(n(i)), (m(i)) \in [\mathbb{N}]$ so that $\sum x(i)e_{n(i)} = \sum y(i)e_{m(i)}$. The distance in distribution between x and y is defined as

$$d(x, y) = \inf \{ \|\tilde{x} - \tilde{y}\| : \tilde{x} \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} x \text{ and } \tilde{y} \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} y \} .$$

For $E \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ we set $Ex = \sum_{i \in E} x(i)e_i$.

In order to prove Theorem B we first prove

Proposition 4.1. *Let (e_i) be a normalized basic sequence having spreading model (s_i) which is K -equivalent to the unit vector basis of ℓ_1 . Assume that there exists a normalized block basis (x_i) of (s_i) which satisfies*

- 1) $\lim_i \|x_i\|_{\ell_1} = K$ and
- 2) (x_i) is Cauchy in distribution

(i.e., for all $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists n_0 with $d(x_n, x_m) < \varepsilon$ if $n, m \geq n_0$). Then there exists a block basis (y_i) of (e_i) having spreading model 1-equivalent to the unit vector basis of ℓ_1 .

Proof. Let $x_i = \sum_{j \in A_i} a_j^i s_j$ for some choice of scalars and sets of integers $A_1 < A_2 < \dots$.

Using 1), 2) and the fact that (s_i) is K -equivalent to the unit vector basis of ℓ_1 we have the following.

- 3) For all $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ so that for all $n \geq n_0$ there exists $F_n = F_n(\varepsilon) \subseteq A_n$ with $|F_n| \leq |A_{n_0}|$, $\|F_n x_n\|_{\ell_1} > K - \varepsilon$, $d(F_n x_n, x_{n_0}) < \varepsilon$ and $\sum_{i \in A_n \setminus F_n} |a_i^n| < \varepsilon$.

For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ set $y_n = \sum_{i \in A_n} a_i^n e_i$. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $(a_i)_1^k \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ with $\sum_1^k |a_i| = 1$. If $n_0 < n_1 < \dots < n_k$ then from 3) we obtain

$$\left\| \sum_1^k a_i y_{n_i} \right\| \geq \left\| \sum_1^k a_i F_{n_i} y_{n_i} \right\| - \varepsilon .$$

Also

$$\left| \bigcup_1^k \text{supp}(F_{n_i} y_{n_i}) \right| \leq k |A_{n_0}|.$$

Thus for all $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{\substack{n_1 \rightarrow \infty \\ n_1 < \dots < n_k}} \left\| \sum_1^k a_i y_{n_i} \right\| &\geq \liminf_{\substack{n_1 \rightarrow \infty \\ n_1 < \dots < n_k}} \left\| \sum_1^k a_i F_{n_i}(\varepsilon) x_{n_i} \right\| - \varepsilon \\ &\geq \liminf_{\substack{n_1 \rightarrow \infty \\ n_1 < n_2 < \dots < n_k}} \frac{1}{K} \left\| \sum_1^k a_i F_{n_i}(\varepsilon) x_{n_i} \right\|_{\ell_1} - \varepsilon \geq \frac{K - \varepsilon}{K} - \varepsilon, \end{aligned}$$

where $\|\cdot\|_{\ell_1}$ refers to the ℓ_1 -norm w.r.t. the coordinates (s_i) . Since $\lim_n \|y_n\| = 1$ (e.g., use 3) we obtain that (y_n) has a spreading model 1-equivalent to the unit vector basis of ℓ_1 . $\square$

Our argument was motivated by [J].

T (see e.g., [CS], [FJ]) is the completion of the linear space of finitely supported real valued sequences under the implicit norm

$$\|x\| = \|x\|_\infty \vee \sup \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \|E_i x\| : n \in \mathbb{N}, n \leq E_1 < \dots < E_n \right\}.$$

Proof of Theorem B. We may assume that X has a basis (b_i) which is a block basis of (t_i) , the unit vector basis for T . Let (e_i) be a normalized block basis of (b_i) where e_i is a $(1 + \varepsilon_i) - \ell_1^{m_i}$ average for some sequences $m_i \uparrow \infty$ and $\varepsilon_i \downarrow 0$. Thus $e_i = (\sum_1^{m_i} \omega_j) / \|\sum_1^{m_i} \omega_j\|$ where $(\omega_j)_1^{m_i}$ a normalized block basis of (b_n) which is $(1 + \varepsilon_i)$ -equivalent to the unit vector basis of $\ell_1^{m_i}$. By passing to a subsequence we may assume that (e_i) has a spreading model (s_i) .

Let $x \in \langle t_i \rangle$ be fixed with $x \leq t_n$ and let $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $(a_i)_1^k \subseteq \mathbb{R}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} &\overline{\lim}_{\substack{n_1 \rightarrow \infty \\ n_1 < \dots < n_k}} \sup \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^\ell \left\| E_j \left(x + \sum_1^k a_i e_{n_i} \right) \right\| : \ell \leq E_1 < \dots < E_\ell, \ell \leq n \right\} \\ &\leq \|x\| + \frac{1}{2} \sum_1^k |a_i|. \end{aligned}$$

This follows from the fact that since e_{n_i} is a $(1 + \varepsilon_{n_i}) - \ell_1^{m_{n_i}}$ average

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \sup \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \|E_j a_i e_{n_i}\| : \ell \leq E_1 < \dots < E_{\ell}, \ell \leq n \right\} \\ = \frac{1}{2} |a_i| \quad (\text{see e.g., [OTW]}). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\left\| \sum_1^k a_i s_i \right\| \leq \sup_i \left(|a_i| + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i+1}^k |a_j| \right).$$

However since $\lim_i \|e_i\|_{\infty} = 0$ if k is fixed and $\varepsilon > 0$, then for i sufficiently large we have for some choice of $E_1 < \dots < E_{\ell}$ that $1 = \|e_i\| \leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_1^{\ell} \|E_j e_i\| + \varepsilon$ where $\ell \leq m - k$, $m = \min E_1$. This yields that for all k , $(a_i)_1^k \subseteq \mathbb{R}$,

$$(4) \quad \left\| \sum_1^k a_i s_i \right\| = \max_i \left(|a_i| + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i+1}^k |a_j| \right).$$

All that remains is to show that Proposition 3.1 applies to (e_i) and (s_i) . (s_i) is 2-equivalent to the unit vector basis of ℓ_1 . Set

$$\begin{aligned} x_1 &= \frac{1}{2} s_1 + \frac{2}{3} s_2, \\ x_2 &= \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^2 s_3 + \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^2 s_4 + \frac{2}{3} s_5, \\ x_3 &= \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^3 s_6 + \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^3 s_7 + \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^2 s_8 + \frac{2}{3} s_9, \quad \text{etc.} \end{aligned}$$

In general x_n has the same distribution as

$$\left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^n s_1 + \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^n s_2 + \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^{n-1} s_3 + \dots + \frac{2}{3} s_{n+1}$$

and (x_n) is a block basis of (s_i) . It is easy to check by (4) that $\|x_n\| = 1$ and $\lim_n \|x_n\|_{\ell_1} = 2$. Also (x_n) is Cauchy in distribution since for $n < m$

$$d(x_n, x_m) \leq \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^n + \sum_{n+1}^m \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^i + \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^m. \quad \square$$

Remark 4.2. The above argument yields the following. Let (x_i) be a normalized basic sequence having spreading model (e_i) equivalent to the unit vector basis of ℓ_1 . Let

$$K \equiv \sup \left\{ \sum_1^n |a_i| : \left\| \sum_1^n a_i e_i \right\| = 1 \right\}.$$

Let $E_{\mathbb{Q}}$ be the completion of $\langle e_q : q \in \mathbb{Q} \rangle$ under $\|\sum_1^n a_i e_{q_i}\| = \|\sum_1^n a_i e_i\|$ if $q_1 < \dots < q_n$. Suppose there exists $x \in E_{\mathbb{Q}}$ with $\|x\| = 1$ and $\|x\|_{\ell_1} = K$. Then there exists a normalized block basis (y_i) of (x_i) having spreading model 1-equivalent to the unit vector basis of ℓ_1 . However such an x need not exist (consider $\|x\| = \|x\|_{c_0} + \|x\|_{\ell_1}$).

Remark 4.3. If $|\cdot|$ is any equivalent norm on T then for all $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a spreading model of a normalized block basis of (e_i) which is $1 + \varepsilon$ -equivalent to the unit vector basis of ℓ_1 . In fact one has [BL, p.43] more generally if (e_i) is a basic sequence with spreading model equivalent to the unit vector basis of ℓ_1 , then for all $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a spreading model of a normalized block basis of (e_i) which is $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -equivalent to the unit vector basis of ℓ_1 .

In [OS] it is proved that if X does not contain ℓ_1 then X can be renormed so that if (s_i) is a spreading model of a normalized sequence (x_n) then $\|s_1 + s_2\| = 1$ implies that (x_n) is not weakly null. Here we give an explicit renorming of T with this property.

Proposition 4.4. *T can be given an equivalent norm $\|\cdot\|$ satisfying that if (s_n) is a spreading model of a normalized block basis of $(T, \|\cdot\|)$ then*

$$\|s_1 + s_2\| < 2 .$$

First we construct an equivalent norm for T . Fix $0 < q < 1/2$ and let $\|\cdot\|$ be defined on c_{00} by the implicit equation

$$(1) \quad \|x\| = \|x\|_{\infty} \vee \sup \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \|E_i x\| + q \max_{j \leq n} \|E_j x\| : n \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } n \leq E_1 < \dots < E_n \right\} .$$

As in [FJ] $\|\cdot\|$ extends to a norm on the completion X of $(c_{00}, \|\cdot\|)$ which satisfies (1) for all $x \in X$. We postpone the proof of our next proposition which says that X is T under an equivalent norm for certain q .

Proposition 4.5. $\|\cdot\|$ is an equivalent norm on T if $(\frac{1}{2} + q)^2 < \frac{1}{2}$.

Given $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $x \in c_{00}$ set

$$|x|_n = \max \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \|E_i x\| : n \leq E_1 < \cdots < E_n \right\}$$

and

$$\|x\|_n = \max \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \|E_i x\| + q \max_{j \leq n} \|E_j x\| : n \leq E_1 < \cdots < E_n \right\}.$$

As usual we let (e_i) be the unit vector basis of c_{00} .

Lemma 4.6. Let (y_i) be a block basis of (e_i) satisfying: for all $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $m \in \mathbb{N}$ with $1 \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |y_n|_m > 1 - \varepsilon$. Then $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|y_n\| > 1$.

Proof. By passing to a subsequence we may assume that for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |y_n|_m =: 1 - \varepsilon_m \quad \text{where } \varepsilon_m \downarrow 0.$$

We may also assume that for any $n > m$ there exists sets $m \leq E_1^{(m,n)} < \cdots < E_m^{(m,n)}$ so that

$$(1) \quad 1 - 2\varepsilon_m \leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^m \|E_j^{(m,n)} y_n\| \leq |y_n|_m.$$

Furthermore we may assume that there exists a subsequence M of $\mathbb{N}$ such that if $m < m'$ are integers in M then for all $n \geq m'$ and $i \leq m'$ there exists $j \leq m$ with $E_i^{(m',n)} \subseteq E_j^{(m,n)}$. Indeed we can first choose sets to satisfy (1) with lower estimate “ $1 - \frac{3}{2}\varepsilon_m$.” If $m_1 < \cdots < m_k$ in M have been chosen we then choose m_{k+1} so large that the chosen sets for m_{k+1} can be split, if necessary, up to $m_1 + \cdots + m_k$ additional times by first deleting, if necessary, the smallest $m_1 + \cdots + m_k$ terms of the form $\|E_\ell^{m_{k+1},n} y_n\|$ at a cost of at most $\varepsilon_m/2$.

Choose $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ so that $2(\frac{1}{2} + q)(1 - \varepsilon_0) > 1$ and choose $m_0 \in M$ with $2\varepsilon_{m_0} < \varepsilon_0$. Thus for $n > m_0$

$$(2) \quad \begin{aligned} & \left(\frac{1}{2} + q\right) \sum_{i=1}^{m_0} \|E_i^{(m_0, n)} y_n\| > 2 \left(\frac{1}{2} + q\right) (1 - \varepsilon_0) \\ & > 1 = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{m_0} \sum_{\substack{j \leq m \\ E_j^{(m, n)} \subseteq E_i^{(m_0, n)}}} \|E_j^{(m, n)} y_n\|. \end{aligned}$$

From (2) we see that for some subsequence M' of M we have for some $i_0 \leq m_0$

$$\left(\frac{1}{2} + q\right) \lim_{\substack{n \in M' \\ n \rightarrow \infty}} \|E_{i_0}^{(m_0, n)} y_n\| > \lim_{\substack{m \in M' \\ m \rightarrow \infty}} \lim_{\substack{n \in M' \\ n \rightarrow \infty}} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{j \leq m \\ E_j^{(m, n)} \subseteq E_{i_0}^{(m_0, n)}}} \|E_j^{(m, n)} y_n\|.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|y_n\| & \geq \limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left[\left(\frac{1}{2} + q\right) \|E_{i_0}^{(m_0, n)} y_n\| \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{i \neq i_0 \\ i \leq m_0}} \sum_{\substack{j \leq m \\ E_j^{(m, n)} \subseteq E_i^{(m_0, n)}}} \|E_j^{(m, n)} y_n\| \right] \\ & > \limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^m \|E_i^{(m, n)} y_n\| = 1. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Proof of Proposition 4.4.

Let $\|\cdot\|$ be the norm given in Proposition 4.5 (for some fixed q). Let $\|\cdot\| = \|\cdot\| + |\cdot|$ where $|x| = \sup\{\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \|E_i x\| : n \leq E_1 < \dots < E_n\}$, i.e., $|x| = \sup_n |x|_n$. $\|\cdot\|$ is an equivalent norm on T . Let $(x_n) \subseteq T$ be a $\|\cdot\|$ semi-normalized block basis of (e_i) with a spreading model (s_n) . We shall prove that $\|s_1 + s_2\| < 2\|s_1\|$.

If not then we may assume that $\|x_n\| = 1$ for all n , $\lim_n |x_n| = A$, $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |x_m + x_n| = 2A$ and $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|x_m + x_n\| = 2$. By passing to a subsequence using Ramsey's theorem we may assume that for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$ there exist $\ell_1(m) \in \mathbb{N}$ so that $\|x_m + x_n\| = \|x_m + x_n\|_{\ell_1(m)}$ whenever $m < n$.

Also we note that $A < 1$. Otherwise Lemma 4.6 could be applied to a suitable subsequence of (x_n) to yield $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|x_n\| > 1$.

For each $m < n$ choose $i(m, n) \leq \ell_1(m)$ and $\ell_1(m) \leq E_1^{(m,n)} < \dots < E_{\ell_1(m)}^{(m,n)}$ with

$$\|x_m + x_n\| = \left(\frac{1}{2} + q\right) \|E_{i(m,n)}^{(m,n)}(x_m + x_n)\| + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \neq i(m,n)} \|E_i^{(m,n)}(x_m + x_n)\|$$

By passing again to a subsequence we may assume that we have one of the following three cases.

Case 1. For all $m < n$, $E_{i(m,n)}^{(m,n)} \cap \text{supp}(x_n) = \emptyset$.

In this case

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|x_m + x_n\| \leq \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (|x_n| + \|x_m\|) = A + 1 < 2 ,$$

a contradiction.

Case 2 is handled similarly.

Case 2. For all $m < n$, $E_{i(m,n)}^{(m,n)} \cap \text{supp}(x_m) = \emptyset$.

Case 3. For all $m < n$

$$E_{i(m,n)}^{(m,n)} \cap \text{supp}(x_n) \neq \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad E_{i(m,n)}^{(m,n)} \cap \text{supp}(x_m) \neq \emptyset .$$

Since $A < 1$ we may assume by similar considerations to those in cases 1) and 2) that there exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ with for all $m < n$

$$(1) \quad \left(\frac{1}{2} + q\right) \|E_{i(m,n)}^{(m,n)} x_m\| > \varepsilon_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \left(\frac{1}{2} + q\right) \|E_{i(m,n)}^{(m,n)} x_n\| > \varepsilon_0 .$$

Now for $m < n$,

$$(2) \quad \begin{aligned} \|x_m + x_n\| &\leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{i(m,n)-1} \|E_i^{(m,n)} x_m\| \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{1}{2} + q\right) \|E_{i(m,n)}^{(m,n)} x_m\| + \left(\frac{1}{2} + q\right) \|E_{i(m,n)}^{(m,n)} x_n\| \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=i(m,n)+1}^{\ell_1(m)} \|E_i^{(m,n)} x_n\| \leq 2 . \end{aligned}$$

Since $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|x_m + x_n\| = 2$ we may assume

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|E_{i(m,n)}^{(m,n)}(x_m + x_n)\| = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left[\|E_{i(m,n)}^{(m,n)}x_m\| + \|E_{i(m,n)}^{(m,n)}x_n\| \right] .$$

Thus by once more passing to a subsequence we may assume that for all m there exists $\ell_2(m)$ so that if $m < n$ then

$$\|E_{i(m,n)}^{(m,n)}x_n\| < \|E_{i(m,n)}^{(m,n)}x_n\|_{\ell_2(m)} + \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2} \left(1 - q - \frac{1}{2}\right) .$$

Now for each m if n is sufficiently large (e.g., if $\min \text{supp}(x_n) \geq \ell_1(m) + \ell_2(m)$) then

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_n\| &\geq \|E_{i(m,n)}^{(m,n)}x_n\|_{\ell_2(m)} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=i(m,n)+1}^{\ell_1(m)} \|E_i^{(m,n)}x_n\| \\ &\geq \left(1 - q - \frac{1}{2}\right) \|E_{i(m,n)}^{(m,n)}x_n\| - \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2} \left(1 - q - \frac{1}{2}\right) \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{1}{2} + q\right) \|E_{i(m,n)}^{(m,n)}x_n\| + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=i(m,n)+1}^{\ell_1(m)} \|E_i^{(m,n)}x_n\| . \end{aligned}$$

As $m \rightarrow \infty$, $m < n$ the last line converges to 1 by virtue of (2). From (1) we have $\|E_{i(m,n)}^{(m,n)}x_n\| > \varepsilon_0$. Thus the entire expression is, in the limit,

$$\geq \left(1 - q - \frac{1}{2}\right) \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2} + 1 > 1 ,$$

a contradiction. $\square$

Proof of Proposition 4.5.

For $0 < c < 1$ define the following (implicit) norms on c_{00} .

$$\begin{aligned} N_c^{(1)}(x) = \|x\|_\infty \vee \max \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq i_0}}^n N_c^{(1)}(E_i x) + c N_c^{(1)}(E_{i_0} x) : \right. \\ \left. n \leq E_1 < \cdots < E_n , \ 1 \leq i_0 \leq n \right\} . \end{aligned}$$

Thus the norm $\|\cdot\|$ in (1) equals $N_c^{(1)}(x)$ if $c = \frac{1}{2} + q$.

$$\begin{aligned} N_c^{(2)}(x) = & \|x\|_\infty \vee \max \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq i_0}}^n N_c^{(2)}(E_i x) \right. \\ & + c \max \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^m N_c^{(2)}(F_j x) : m \leq F_1 < \dots < F_m, \right. \\ & \left. \left. E_{i_0-1} < F_1, F_m < E_{i_0+1} \right\} : n \leq E_1 < \dots < E_n, 1 \leq i_0 \leq n \right\} \end{aligned}$$

We also define

$$\begin{aligned} N^{(2)}(x) &= N_{1/2}^{(2)}(x), \\ N^{(3)}(x) &= \|x\|_\infty \vee \max \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n N^{(2)}(E_i x) : n \leq E_1 < \dots < E_n \right\}, \\ N^{(4)}(x) &= \|x\|_\infty \vee \max \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{3n} N^{(4)}(E_i x) : n \leq E_1 < \dots < E_{3n} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

We shall prove that $N_c^{(1)}$ and $N^{(4)}$ are equivalent norms when $c^2 \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and $c \geq \frac{1}{2}$. This will complete the proof. Indeed (e_i) , the unit vector basis for T is equivalent to (e_{3i}) ([CJT] or [CS, p.35]) and for all $(a_i) \in c_{00}$,

$$N^{(4)}\left(\sum a_i e_i\right) = \left\| \sum a_i e_{3i} \right\|_T.$$

We establish three claims.

Claim 1. $N_c^{(1)}(x) \leq 2N_{c^2}^{(2)}(x)$ if $c \geq \frac{1}{2}$.

The proof is by induction on $k = \# \text{supp}(x)$. If $k = 1$ the claim is clear. Assume that $N_c^{(1)}(x) \leq 2N_{c^2}^{(2)}(x)$ if $\# \text{supp}(x) \leq k$. Let $\# \text{supp } x = k + 1$. We may assume that

$$N_c^{(1)}(x) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq i_0}}^n N_c^{(1)}(E_i x) + c N_c^{(1)}(E_{i_0} x)$$

for some $n \leq E_1 < \dots < E_n$ and $1 \leq i_0 \leq n$ with $E_{i_0}x \neq 0$ and $E_jx \neq 0$ for some $j \neq i_0$. Thus we can apply the induction hypothesis to every E_ix .

Case 1. $N_c^{(1)}(E_{i_0}x) = \|E_{i_0}x\|_\infty$.

Then by the induction hypothesis,

$$\begin{aligned} N_c^{(1)}(x) &\leq 2 \left[\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq i_0}}^n N_{c^2}^{(2)}(E_ix) + \frac{c}{2} \|E_{i_0}x\|_\infty \right] \\ &\leq 2 \left[\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq i_0}}^n N_{c^2}^{(2)}(E_ix) + c^2 \max \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^m N_{c^2}^{(2)}(F_jx) : m \leq F_1 < \dots < F_m, \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. E_{i_0} < F_1, F_m < E_{i_0+1} \right\} \right] \\ &\leq 2N_{c^2}^{(2)}(x). \end{aligned}$$

The second inequality uses that $\frac{c}{2} \leq c^2$ since $c \geq \frac{1}{2}$.

Case 2.

$$N_c^{(1)}(E_{i_0}x) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq j_0}}^m N_c^{(1)}(F_jx) + cN_c^{(1)}(F_{j_0}x)$$

for some $m \leq F_1 < \dots < F_m$, $j_0 \leq m$ with $F_{j_0}x \neq 0$.

We may assume (all our norms are 1-unconditional) that $E_{i_0-1} < F_1 < F_m < E_{i_0+1}$. By the induction hypothesis,

$$\begin{aligned} N_c^{(1)}(x) &\leq 2 \left[\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq i_0}}^n N_{c^2}^{(2)}(E_ix) + \frac{c}{2} \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq j_0}}^m N_{c^2}^{(2)}(F_jx) + c^2 N_{c^2}^{(2)}(F_{j_0}x) \right] \\ &\leq 2 \left[\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq i_0}}^n N_{c^2}^{(2)}(E_ix) + c^2 \sum_{j=1}^m N_{c^2}^{(2)}(F_jx) \right] \\ &\leq 2N_{c^2}^{(2)}(x), \text{ where we have again used that } \frac{c}{2} \leq c^2. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of Claim 1.

Note that if $\frac{1}{2} \leq c < 1$ and $c^2 \leq \frac{1}{2}$ then $N_c^{(1)}(x) \leq 2N_{c^2}^{(2)}(x) \leq 2N^{(2)}(x)$.

Claim 2. $N^{(3)}(\cdot) \leq N^{(4)}(\cdot)$

The proof is again by induction on $k = \# \text{supp}(x)$. If $k = 1$ the claim is clear. Assume the claim holds for all x with $\# \text{supp}(x) \leq k$ and let $\# \text{supp}(x) = k + 1$. We may suppose that for some $n \leq E_1 < \dots < E_n$, $N^{(3)}(x) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n N^{(2)}(E_i x)$. For each i either $N^{(2)}(E_i x) = \|E_i x\|_\infty$ or there exist integers $s(i) \leq n(i)$ and $m(i)$ and sets

$$n(i) \leq E_1^i < \dots < E_{s(i)-1}^i < F_1^i < \dots < F_{m(i)}^i < E_{s(i)+1}^i < \dots < E_{n(i)}^i$$

with $m(i) \leq F_1^i$ so that

$$N^{(2)}(E_i x) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{s=1}^{s(i)-1} N^{(2)}(E_s^i x) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{t=1}^{m(i)} N^{(2)}(F_t^i x) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{s=s(i)+1}^{n(i)} N^{(2)}(E_s^i x) .$$

Thus if we set

$$E_i^+ = \bigcup_{s > s(i)} E_s^i, \quad E_i^- = \bigcup_{s < s(i)} E_s^i \quad \text{and} \quad E_i^0 = \bigcup_{j=1}^{m(i)} F_j^i$$

in the latter case and take $E_i^+ = E_i$ (and $E_i^- = E_i^0 = \emptyset$) in the former we have

$$\begin{aligned} N^{(3)}(x) &\leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(N^{(3)}(E_i^- x) + N^{(3)}(E_i^0 x) + N^{(3)}(E_i^+ x) \right) \\ &\leq \max \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{3n} N^{(3)}(\tilde{E}_i x) : n \leq \tilde{E}_1 < \dots < \tilde{E}_{3n} \right\} \\ &\leq \max \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{3n} N^{(4)}(\tilde{E}_i x) : n \leq \tilde{E}_1 < \dots < \tilde{E}_{3n} \right\} \\ &\leq N^{(4)}(x) . \end{aligned}$$

We used the induction hypothesis to obtain the next to last inequality.

Claim 3. $N^{(2)}(\cdot) \leq 2N^{(4)}(\cdot)$

As in Claim 2 we may assume that

$$\begin{aligned}
N^{(2)}(x) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{i_0-1} N^{(2)}(E_i x) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=i_0+1}^n N^{(2)}(E_i x) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^m N^{(2)}(F_j x) \\
&\leq N^{(3)}\left(\bigcup_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq i_0}}^n E_i x\right) + N^{(3)}\left(\bigcup_{j=1}^m F_j x\right) \\
&\leq 2N^{(3)}(x)
\end{aligned}$$

Thus by Claim 2, the result follows.

The proposition now follows from our claims:

$$\|\cdot\|_T \leq N_c^{(1)}(\cdot) \leq 2N_{c^2}(2)(\cdot) \leq 2N^{(2)}(x) \leq 4N^{(4)}(\cdot)$$

where the second inequality uses that $c = \frac{1}{2} + q$ satisfies $c^2 < \frac{1}{2}$. $\square$

Remark. The proof shows that none of our equivalent norms can arbitrarily distort T . Moreover they all satisfy $|\sum_1^n x_i| \geq \frac{1}{2} \sum_1^n |x_i|$ if $n \leq x_1 < \dots < x_n$. By [OTW, Theorem 6.2] such norms do not arbitrarily distort T .

REFERENCES

- [AA] D. Alspach and S. Argyros, *Complexity of weakly null sequences*, Diss. Math. **321** (1992).
- [AO] G. Androulakis and E. Odell, *Distorting mixed Tsirelson spaces*, preprint.
- [AD] S. Argyros and I. Deliyanni, *Examples of asymptotically ℓ^1 Banach spaces*, preprint.
- [AMT] S. Argyros, S. Merkourakis and A. Tsarpalias, *Convex unconditionality and summability of weakly null sequences*, preprint.
- [BL] B. Beauzamy and J.-T. Lapresté, *Modèles étalés des espaces de Banach*, Travaux en Cours, Herman, Paris, 1984.
- [B] B. Bourgain, *On convergent sequences of continuous functions*, Bull. Soc. Math. Bel. **3** (1980), 235–249.
- [CJT] P.G. Casazza, W.B. Johnson and L. Tzafriri, *On Tsirelson's space*, Israel J. Math. **47** (1984), 81–98.
- [CS] P.G. Casazza and T.J. Shura, *Tsirelson's Space*, Lectures Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1363, Springer-Verlag, Berlin and New York, 1989.
- [E] E. Ellentuck, *A new proof that analytic sets are Ramsey*, J. Symbolic Logic **39** (1974), 163–165.
- [FJ] T. Figiel and W.B. Johnson, *A uniformly convex Banach space which contains no ℓ_p* , Comp. Math. **29** (1974), 179–190.
- [J] R.C. James, *Uniformly nonsquare Banach spaces*, Ann. of Math. **80** (1964), 542–550.
- [O] E. Odell, *Applications of Ramsey theorems to Banach space theory*, Notes in Banach spaces (H.E. Lacey, ed.), University Press, Austin and London, 1980, pp. 379–404.

- [OS] E. Odell and Th. Schlumprecht, *On asymptotic properties of Banach spaces under renormings*, preprint.
- [OTW] E. Odell, N. Tomczak and R. Wagner, *Proximity to ℓ_1 and distortion in asymptotic ℓ_1 spaces*, preprint.
- [R] H. Rosenthal, *A characterization of Banach spaces containing ℓ_1* , Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. (U.S.A.) **71** (1974), 2411–2413.